REMARKS

Independent claims 1 and 10 and particular dependent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz (PCT Pub. No. WO 01/69420). Claims 1, 2, 10, and 14 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled. New independent claim 17 and new dependent claims 18-27 have been added.

Written description support for these amendments is found throughout the originally filed specification, for example, at page 1, line 7 to line 16; at page 3, line 14 to line 24; at page 4, line 22 to page 5 line 25; at page 7, line 23 to line 31; at page 8, line 1 to line 10; at page 9, line 1 to page 10, line 10; and FIGS. 1, 2, and 5-7. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-27 are pending in this Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9

Independent claim 1 has been amended to describe the subject matter of original dependent claim 4. Original dependent claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Lakritz reference fails to disclose each and every element of original dependent claim 4 (now independent claim 1).

Unlike claim 1, Lakritz fails to disclose a method that includes "determining from a login by the front-end application that the textual information should be output in the first language." Rather, Lakrtiz discloses in connection with FIG. 3 that the "Web site visitor's language and country" are determined by a list of criteria including "language preference setting in the browser, cookie from previous visit to the Web site," and others. (Lakritz at p. 6, lines 12-21; *see* FIG. 3). None of the criteria disclosed by Lakritz include determining the output language from a login by the same front-end application that requests execution of a task associated with a data mining model. Indeed the Office Action provides no explanation of how Lakritz discloses a "data mining model" at all. This is because Lakritz does not reference data mining models or analytical tasks associated with data mining models.

Applicant : Achim Kraiss et al.
Serial No. : 10/664,771
Filed : September 17, 2003
Page : 8 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-109001 / 2003P00171 US01

Lakrtiz does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 1, and thus does not to anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Nor does Lakritz articulate a reasoning that would have prompted a skilled artisan to modify Lakritz's Web site system in order to achieve the claimed method. As previously described, Lakritz does not reference data mining models or analytical tasks associated with data mining models, and consequently does not suggest multi-language support for data mining models as described in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Lakrtiz, either alone or in combination with any other reference cited in the record. Dependent claims 2-3 and 5-9 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 and for the additional inventive features described therein.

Claims 10-16

Independent claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lakritz. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is patentable over Lakritz because the Lakritz reference fails to disclose each and every element of claim 10.

Unlike claim 10, Lakritz fails to disclose a method that includes "receiving a back-end model output from the back-end analytical engine, the back-end model output including information generated in response to the execution of the data mining model based upon the input data of the task request." Rather, Lakritz discloses that a previously stored, static "document template" of a Web site is called upon to create "localized documents" in the form of web pages having a selected language. (Lakritz at p. 7, lines 17-19; p. 13, lines 20-22). Because Lakritz is lacking the back-end model output generated in response to the execution of the data mining model, Lakritz also fails to disclose "inserting the first entry from the contents of the extension document into the back-end model output to produce an updated model output."

Lakrtiz does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 10, and thus does not to anticipate claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Nor does Lakritz articulate a reasoning that would have prompted a skilled artisan to modify Lakritz's Web site system in order to achieve the claimed method. As previously described, Lakritz does not reference data mining models

and certainly does not suggest outputting textual descriptions of data fields in a data mining model as described in claim 10.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 is patentable over Lakrtiz, either alone or in combination with any other reference cited in the record. Dependent claims 11-16 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 10 and for the additional inventive features described therein.

Claims 17-27

New independent claim 17 was added. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 17 is patentable over Lakritz either alone or in combination with any other reference cited in the record. For example, Lakritz fails to describe any "request from the front-end application including input data that is employed by a back-end analytical engine to execute the data mining model to generate a back-end model output, the back-end model output including the unique identifier." Other cited references such as Russakovsky (U.S. Patent No. 7,024,417) are also lacking. New dependent claims 18-27 are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 17 and for the additional inventive features described therein.

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants submit that claims 1-3 and 5-27 are patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the claim amendments herein do not signify concession of unpatentability of claims 1, 2, 10, and 14 prior to the amendments herein. Applicants hereby specifically reserve the right to

Applicant : Achim Kraiss et al.
Serial No. : 10/664,771
Filed : September 17, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-109001 / 2003P00171
US01

prosecute the previously presented subject matter of claims 1, 2, 10, and 14 (prior to the amendment herein) in a continuation application. Also, Applicants hereby specifically reserve the right to prosecute claims of different or broader scope in a continuation application. The Examiner should infer no (i) adoption of a position with respect to patentability, (ii) change in the Applicant's position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or (iii) acquiescence in any way to any position taken by the Examiner, based on the amendments made herein.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 06-1050 in the amount of $300 for excess claim fees. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 28, 2007

Michael T. Hawkins
Reg. No. 57,867

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60422028.doc